



3712

PTO/SB/21 (02-04)
Approved for use through 07/31/2006. OMB 0651-0031
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

TRANSMITTAL FORM

(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)

		Application Number	10/757,852
		Filing Date	January 14, 2004
		First Named Inventor	Michael S. Holgate
		Art Unit	3712
		Examiner Name	Urszula M. Cegielnik
Total Number of Pages in This Submission	11	Attorney Docket Number	121E-0164U

ENCLOSURES (Check all that apply)

<input type="checkbox"/> Fee Transmittal Form	<input type="checkbox"/> Drawing(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> After Allowance communication to Technology Center (TC)
<input type="checkbox"/> Fee Attached.	<input type="checkbox"/> Licensing-related Papers	<input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Amendment/Reply	<input type="checkbox"/> Petition	<input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to TC (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief)
<input type="checkbox"/> After Final	<input type="checkbox"/> Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application	<input type="checkbox"/> Proprietary Information
<input type="checkbox"/> Affidavits/declaration(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> Power of Attorney, Revocation	<input type="checkbox"/> Status Letter
<input type="checkbox"/> Extension of Time Request	<input type="checkbox"/> Change of Correspondence Address	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below):
<input type="checkbox"/> Express Abandonment Request	<input type="checkbox"/> Terminal Disclaimer	
<input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement	<input type="checkbox"/> Request for Refund	
<input type="checkbox"/> Certified Copy of Priority Document(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> CD, Number of CD(s) _____	
<input type="checkbox"/> Response to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application		
<input type="checkbox"/> Response to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53		

Remarks

Return Post Card
Examiner's Interview Summary

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT

Firm or Individual name	EVERMAN LAW FIRM, PA
Signature	
Date	June 14, 2005

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below.

Typed or printed name	Gregory R. Everman		
Signature		Date	June 14, 2005

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.14. This collection is estimated to 2 hours to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.



**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
PATENT EXAMINING OPERATIONS**

Appl. No. :	10/757,852	Confirmation No. :	4606
Applicant :	Michael S. Holgate		
Filed :	January 14, 2004		
TC/A.U. :	3712		
Examiner :	Urszula M. Cegielnik		
Docket No. :	121E-0164U		
Customer No. :	000037953		
Title :	FLYING DISC HAVING CONTOURED FEATURES		

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

EXAMINER'S INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the Interview and taking the time to reach a tentative agreement regarding allowance of the rejected claims upon amending claim 13 and correcting the objection to claim 17. The follow summarizes an Examiner's Interview for the above-identified Application for Patent.

On March 30, 2005, a telephonic interview was conducted between Examiner Urszula M. Cegielnik and Counsel for Applicant, Gregory R. Everman. On April 7, 2005, Applicant received an Interview Summary from the Examiner.

Rejected claims 13, 21 and 27 and objected claim 17 were discussed. The remaining claims (including Claim 17) were indicated as allowable in the Office Action dated March 14, 2005 if rewritten in independent form.

Counsel asserted that rejected claims 13, 21 and 27 are patentable over Clark (U.S. Patent No. 4,979,922). Specifically, claim 13 requires a flight deck section having a plurality of contoured features forming cavities in the flight deck section. Claim 13 additionally requires that the contoured features extend beneath a plane defined by the flight deck section. Neither of these features are taught or suggested by Clark.

Counsel noted first that Clark does not disclose a flying disc having flight deck section with cavities. Instead, Clark discloses a removable insert (for the purpose of allowing the flying saucer to skip on a fluid surface) wherein the insert may be inserted into a flying saucer. That is, the flying saucer itself does not have a plurality of cavities as required by claim 13.

In this regard the Examiner stated that the insert could be considered as part of the flying saucer since they could be attached together and, therefore, the combination of the flying saucer and insert constitutes a flight deck section. As such, the cavities in the insert are in the flight deck section.

Counsel objected to the Examiner's position. The limitations of Claim 13 specifically require that the cavities are within the flying disc flight deck section itself, whereas Clark teaches a flying saucer flight deck section without cavities. Moreover, providing cavities in the insert of Clark provides no motivation to form cavities in the flying saucer flight deck. The cavities within the insert provide gripping surfaces for throwing the saucer-insert combination to skip it off water. To have the device skip off water, the insert necessarily fills in the inside bottom surface of the flying disc to provide a suitably flat skipping surface. As such, the insert eliminates the conventional gripping surface (inside the rim) of the flying saucer. Accordingly, when the flying saucer is being thrown through the air and not being skipped on water (as in the manner that the claimed invention is used) there is no suggestion or motivation to provide cavities within the flight deck as the thrower has full access to grip the inside portion of the rim for throwing the flying saucer.

More importantly, in the present invention, the principal reason for the cavities is to create a Coanda effect. Paragraph [0050]. That is, as the disc revolves and travels, air passing over the disc is entrained by the cavities in the surface of the disc thereby causing a rear spoiler type of effect to assist in maintaining flight stability. Paragraph [0050]. Clark's insert cavities cannot achieve the Coanda effect as they are positioned on the bottom of the insert instead of in the flight deck section and, furthermore, there is no contemplation by Clark whatsoever to create such an effect.

Counsel further objected that even if the flying saucer and insert were jointly considered as being the flying saucer (and i.e. jointly forming the flight deck section) the contoured features which define the cavities do not extend beneath a plane defined by the flight deck section. As shown in FIG. 3 of Clark, the contoured features that form the cavities are positioned in the bottom surface of the insert and directed upward into the insert. Accordingly, the contoured features do not extend beneath the flight deck plane as required by Claim 13.

Although Counsel believes that the above distinctions between Claim 13 and Clark are sound, the Examiner and Counsel tentatively agreed to amend Claim 13 to include a further distinguishing limitation by stating that the cavities are formed in the top surface of the flight deck. Support for this limitation is replete throughout the Application (see for example paragraphs [0018] and [0039]) and nowhere is such a limitation taught or suggested by Clark.

Although not discussed during the Examiner's Interview, Counsel further limits Claim 13 in the corresponding amendment to include the limitation that the contoured features extend beneath the flight deck section. Counsel believes that the amendment clarifies the previous claim language relating to the contoured features extending beneath the flight deck plane. Support for this limitation is replete throughout the Application (see for example paragraphs [0018] and [0039]). Nowhere is such a limitation taught or suggested by Clark.

Regarding Claim 17, this claim was objected to due to an informality, but otherwise would be allowable. Specifically, Claim 17 was objected to as being depending from Claim 12 which had been canceled. In the amendment, Claim 17 has been rewritten in independent form to include all the limitations of previous Claim 12 and, therefore, should be in condition for allowance.

It is believed that the tentatively approved claims as amended resolve all issues in this matter and, accordingly, Applicant respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

EVERMAN LAW FIRM, PA

By:



Gregory R. Everman
Reg. No. 47,553
Tel: (704) 523-1193